

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 2, 7, 9, 11, 15, 16, 19, and 21-23 have been amended, and claim 6 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, claims 1-3, 7-12, 14-17, and 19-24 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 1, 11, 16, 21, and 22 are independent.

Applicant respectfully submits that the above amendments do not add new matter to the application and are fully supported by the specification. Support for the amendments may be found at least in Figure 9 and at paragraphs [0017], [0050], and [0054] of the specification.

In view of the above amendments and the following Remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending objections and rejections for the reasons discussed below.

***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph***

Claims 1, 11, 16, 21, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Claims 1, 11, 16, 21, and 22 have been amended, thereby rendering this rejection moot. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph rejection of claims 1, 11, 16, 21, and 22.

***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph***

Claims 1, 11, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claims 1, 11, and 16 have been amended for clarification. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 11, and 16, as amended, fully comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection of claims 1, 11, and 16.

***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claims 1-3, 6-12, 14-16, 19, 20, 23, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0059379 applied for by Harvey, *et al.* ("Harvey") in view of U.S. Application Publication No. 2004/0192440 applied for by Evans, *et al.* ("Evans"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

To establish an obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), four factual inquiries must be examined. The four factual inquiries include (a) determining the scope and contents of the prior art; (b) ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims in issue; (c) resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art; and (d) evaluating evidence of secondary consideration. *Graham v. John Deere*, 383 U.S. 1, 17-18 (1966).

In view of these four factors, the analysis supporting a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should be made explicit, and should "identify a reason that would have prompted a person of ordinary skill in the relevant field to combine the [prior art] elements" in the manner claimed. *KSR Int'l. Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 127 S. Ct. 1727, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1396 (2007). The Federal Circuit requires that "rejections on obviousness cannot be sustained with mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness." *In re Kahn*, 441 F.3d 977, 988, 78 USPQ2d 1329, 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2006).

Finally, even if the prior art may be combined, there must be a reasonable expectation of success, and the reference or references, when combined, must disclose or suggest every claimed feature. See *in re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Applicant submits that even if combined, Harvey and Evans fail to disclose or suggest every claimed feature.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*:

confirming whether the community visitor executes or terminates the link program and, in response to selection of the link provided in a second section of the webpage, providing the game program on a web browser page of the community, the game program being loaded on the web browser page without a separate installation process and executed on the web browser page (emphasis added).

Harvey does not teach these features of claim 1. Harvey merely discloses that in order for a user to participate in a game, the user must maintain a local copy of the game at client 110, e.g., by downloading it (see Harvey, paras. [0133] and [0136-0137]). Further, Evans fails to cure the deficiencies of Evans.

Therefore, Harvey and Evans, taken alone or in combination, do not disclose or teach the aforementioned features of claim 1.

Claim 11 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*:

wherein the game program is loaded on a web browser page without a separate installation process and executed on the web browser page in response to selection of the link program linked from a first section of the webpage (emphasis added).

For similar reasons advanced with respect to claim 1, Harvey and Evans fail to teach at least these features of independent claim 11.

Claim 16 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*:

wherein the game program is loaded on a web browser page of the community without a separate installation process and executed on the web browser page in response to selection of the link in a second section of the first webpage (emphasis added).

For similar reasons advanced with respect to claim 1, Harvey and Evans fail to teach at least these features of independent claim 16.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 1, 11, and 16. Claims 2, 3, 7-10, 12, 14, 15, 17, 19-20, and 23-24 depend from claim 1, 11, or 16 and are allowable at least for this reason. Since none of the other prior art of record discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 11, and 16, and all the claims that depend therefrom are allowable.

Claim 17

Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Harvey in view of Evans, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,015,348 issued to Lambright, *et al.* ("Lambright"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 16 is allowable over Harvey and Evans, and Lambright fails to cure the deficiencies of Harvey and Evans noted above with regard to claim 16. Hence, claims 17 is allowable at least because it depends from an allowable claim 16.

Claims 21-22

Claims 21-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Harvey, in view of Evans, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,352,479 issued to Sparks, II ("Sparks"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claims 21 and 22 have been amended to recite, *inter alia*:

confirming whether the community visitor executes or terminates the game program, wherein the game program is loaded on a web browser page of the community without a separate installation process and executed on the web browser page in response to selection of the link on the webpage (emphasis added).

For similar reasons advanced with respect to claim 1, Harvey and Evans fail to teach at least these features of independent claims 21 and 22. Further, Sparks fails to cure the deficiencies of Harvey and Evans.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 21 and 22. Since none of the other prior art of record, whether taken alone or in any combination, discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicant submits that independent claims 21 and 22 are allowable.

**CONCLUSION**

A full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action, and all of the grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, all pending claims are allowable, and the application is in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the number below if it would expedite prosecution. Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/hae-chan park/  
Hae-Chan Park  
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: March 7, 2012

**CUSTOMER NUMBER: 58027**

H.C. Park & Associates, PLC  
8500 Leesburg Pike  
Suite 7500  
Vienna, VA 22182  
Tel: 703-288-5105  
Fax: 703-288-5139  
HCP/SSC/ry